

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

ZERO CLOUD ONE INTELLIGENT  
TECHNOLOGY (HANGZHOU) CO  
LTD,

Plaintiff,

v.

FLYING HELIBALL LLC; WORLD  
TECH TOYS INC.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:24-cv-01699-JNW  
ORDER

**1. INTRODUCTION**

The court raises this matter sua sponte. Plaintiff Zero Cloud One Intelligent Technology (Hangzhou) Co. Ltd. (“Zero Cloud”) seeks a preliminary injunction compelling Defendants Flying Heliball LLC (“Flying Heliball”) and World Tech Toys, Inc. (“World Tech Toys”) to withdraw and cease all claims of patent infringement to Amazon about Zero Cloud’s HOVER Air X1 products. *See* Dkt. Nos. 29, 36. Defendants move to dismiss this action in its entirety because, among other reasons, similar parties and issues are involved in Flying Heliball’s first-filed suit in the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California. Dkt. Nos. 27, 28, 34.



1 Zero Cloud also moved for a temporary restraining order compelling Defendants to  
2 withdraw and cease all patent infringement assertions to Amazon. Dkt. No. 7.

3 On November 4, 2024, the Court denied Zero Cloud’s motion for a temporary  
4 restraining order and, in the same Order, directed the parties to submit briefing  
5 “regarding the optimal case management approach,” including “the application, if  
6 any, of the first-to-file rule on this action.” Dkt. No. 21 at 20. The Court noted that  
7 “Zero Cloud’s likelihood of success on the merits hinges largely on whether Flying  
8 Heliball and World Tech Toys’ patent infringement assertion is in bad faith,” which  
9 is “linked to the issue of actual infringement, which is currently being litigated in  
10 the Central District of California.” *Id.* at 20. After receiving briefing in response to  
11 this Order, Dkt. Nos. 27, 29—plus a motion to dismiss, Dkt. No. 28—the Court  
12 instructed the parties to submit additional briefing about the “first-to-file” rule.  
13 Dkt. No. 33. The Court has since received the parties’ briefing on those issues, *see*  
14 Dkt. Nos. 34, 36, and is fully informed.<sup>2</sup>

### 15 3. DISCUSSION

16 “[T]he power to stay proceedings is incidental to the power inherent in every  
17 court to control the disposition of the causes on its docket with economy of time and  
18 effort for itself, for counsel, and for litigants.” *Landis v. N. Am. Co.*, 299 U.S. 248,  
19 254 (1936). The power extends to stays pending resolution of separate proceedings

---

20  
21 <sup>2</sup> In the meantime, on November 11, 2024, Zero Zero moved to dismiss Flying  
22 Heliball’s patent infringement claim in the Central District of California, arguing  
23 that Flying Heliball failed to state a plausible claim on which relief may be granted.  
*Flying Heliball, LLC v. Zero Zero Robotics, Inc.*, No. 8:24-cv-1838, Dkt. No. 27. A  
hearing on that motion is scheduled for December 16, 2024.

1 and does not require the issues in such proceedings to determine the action before  
2 the Court. *Leyva v. Certified Grocers*, 593 F.2d 857, 863-64 (9th Cir. 1979). Nor does  
3 it require that “the parties to the two causes ... be the same and the issues  
4 identical.” *Landis*, 299 U.S. at 254. The power to stay also includes the power to do  
5 so sua sponte. *Doyle v. One W. Bank, N.A.*, 2015 WL 4605776, at \*3 (C.D. Cal. May  
6 21, 2015). In determining whether a stay is appropriate, the Court must weigh  
7 various interests, including: (1) the possible damage to result from granting the  
8 stay; (2) the hardship to the parties if the suit proceeds; and (3) the “orderly course  
9 of justice measured in terms of the simplifying or complicating of issues, proof, and  
10 questions of law which could be expected to result from a stay.” *Lockyer v. Mirant*  
11 *Corp.*, 398 F.3d 1098, 1110 (9th Cir. 2005). The Court addresses each of these three  
12 interests in turn.

13         The Court finds that the first two interests—possible damage from a stay and  
14 hardship if the suit proceeds—do not weigh against a stay. Plaintiff asks the Court  
15 to *both* grant preliminary injunctive relief *and* stay this action. Dkt. No. 29 at 1.  
16 Defendants move to dismiss but clarify that “[t]he Court should stay this case if it is  
17 not inclined to dismiss.” Dkt. No. 28 at 17. Thus, while the parties’ demands differ,  
18 both parties signal a shared interest in not having to litigate this action while also  
19 litigating overlapping issues in the Central District of California. Therefore, the  
20 Court concludes that any hardship resulting from this suit proceeding outweighs  
21 any possible damage resulting from a stay.

22         The Court also finds that the third interest—the orderly course of justice—  
23 weighs heavily in favor of a stay. The parties dispute the proper application of the

1 first-to-file rule in this case. *See* Dkt. Nos. 34, 36. But even if Flying Heliball’s  
2 infringement suit does not involve “similar issues” or “similar parties” to this case—  
3 and therefore the first-to-file rule does not apply—both parties still agree that the  
4 infringement suit will resolve the issue of infringement, which is crucial for  
5 determining Defendants’ liability here. Thus, this Court need not make any formal  
6 findings on the application of the first-to-file rule to conclude that allowing the  
7 Central District of California infringement suit to proceed through the pleading  
8 stage will “serve the purpose of promoting efficiency” by preventing duplicative—or,  
9 worse, contradictory—findings on the infringement issue. *See Alltrade, Inc. v.*  
10 *Uniweld Prod., Inc.*, 946 F.2d 622, 625 (9th Cir. 1991).

11 As such, the Court concludes that a discretionary stay of this action is  
12 appropriate. In so concluding, the Court declines Zero Cloud’s invitation to issue a  
13 preliminary injunction alongside the stay. *See* Dkt. No. 29 at 1. While Zero Cloud is  
14 correct that courts do sometimes grant preliminary injunctions in patent-related  
15 cases without full-blown *Markman* claim construction proceedings, *see* Dkt. No. 29  
16 at 6 (citing cases), the Court finds—for the same reasons articulated in its earlier  
17 Order, Dkt. No. 21—that Zero Cloud has not satisfied the high burden for obtaining  
18 such an injunction here. *See Garcia v. Google, Inc.*, 786 F.3d 733, 740 (9th Cir. 2015)  
19 (discussing requirements for mandatory injunction); *Hernandez v. Sessions*, 872  
20 F.3d 976, 999 (9th Cir. 2017) (same). Insofar as the “gist of the alleged harm to Zero  
21 Cloud is past and future lost sales,” *see* Dkt. No. 21 at 17, Zero Cloud fails to show  
22  
23

1 irreparable injury.<sup>3</sup> Likewise, this Court will await a finding on the plausibility of  
2 Defendants’ patent infringement claim in the Central District of California before  
3 concluding that Zero Cloud has a high likelihood of success on the merits.

4 **4. CONCLUSION**

5 In sum, the Court STAYS this action until Flying Heliball’s patent  
6 infringement suit, *Flying Heliball, LLC v. Zero Zero Robotics, Inc.*, No. 8:24-cv-1838  
7 (C.D. Cal.), has proceeded through the pleading stage. Accordingly, the Court  
8 STRIKES all pending deadlines in this case. The Court DIRECTS the parties to  
9 notify the Court within SEVEN (7) days of any judicial ruling on Zero Zero’s motion  
10 to dismiss in the Central District of California infringement suit.

11 It is so ORDERED.

12 Dated this 26th day of November, 2024.

13 

14 Jamal N. Whitehead  
15 United States District Judge

16  
17  
18  
19  
20 \_\_\_\_\_  
21 <sup>3</sup> Zero Cloud claims that it “will present [new] irreparable harm evidence, including  
22 that both Defendants combined have a total reported Dun & Bradstreet credit  
23 worthiness of \$7,500” and therefore cannot satisfy a monetary judgment. Dkt. No.  
29 at 4-5. But even assuming Zero Cloud will indeed present this evidence—which it  
has not yet done—it would be unduly speculative for this Court to assume at this  
juncture that Defendants are judgment-proof.